



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,892	09/30/2003	Glen David Merfeld	129500	8086

6147 7590 07/26/2006

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

CHEN, VIVIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,892

Applicant(s)

MERFELD ET AL.

Examiner

Vivian Chen

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-21 and 23-60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 37-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-21,24-36 and 58-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 23 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1773

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2, 22 have been cancelled by Applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in the previous Office Action have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's Amendment filed 5/8/2006.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 4-21, 24-36, 58-60 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-63 of copending Application No. 10/819,524 (US 2005/0159543). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Art Unit: 1773

The above copending Application claims a coating composition comprising the recited polyarylate component A, organic species component B, and optional catalyst component C, and recited solvent-based coating compositions and powder coating compositions, and coated substrates.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

3. Claims 1, 4-20, 58-60 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over:

(a) claims 1-72 of copending Application No. 11/000476 (US 2005/0159542); or

(b) claims 1-27 of copending Application No. 11/299,181 (US 2006/0093826).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

The above copending Applications claim a coating composition comprising the recited polyarylate component A, organic species component B, and optional catalyst component C, and recited solvent-based coating compositions, and coated substrates.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1773

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 4-20, 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over VOLLENBERG ET AL (US 2001/0016626).

VOLLENBERG ET AL '626 discloses coating compositions and substrates coated by said compositions, wherein the coating compositions comprise block copolyestercarbonates and optionally solvents and other conventional additives, wherein the copolyestercarbonate is produced by combining hydroxy-terminated oligomeric polyarylates as recited in claims 1, 58 having molecular weights as recited in claims 12-13; other organic components having functional groups (e.g., carboxylic acids, acid chlorides, etc) in typical amounts of 0.005-1 mol% (for branching agents) or 0.05-10 mol% (for chain-stopping agents) which react with the hydroxyl groups of the polyarylate; and optionally a catalyst. The coating composition optionally contains additional resins (e.g., (meth)acrylate polymers, epoxy-functional copolymers). The coating composition further contains carbonate units and minor amounts of aliphatic organic radicals. (paragraphs 0018, 0021-0022, 0038, 0048, 0050, 0053, 0055, 0057-0058, 0063-0064, 0070-0071, 0076-0077)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the compositions derived from the recited polyarylates, reactive species, and catalysts in order to form durable, weather-resistant protective coatings for various substrates. One of ordinary skill in the art would have used known catalysts in effective amounts (claims 7, 14) to facilitate the reaction between components A and B. It would have been obvious to adjust the relative amounts of component B (claim 6) and known aliphatic diol-derived units (claims 9-11) in the coating composition in order to tailor the mechanical properties

Art Unit: 1773

of the coating for specific applications. One of ordinary skill in the art would have utilized the recited components in known organic-based and/or water-based solvent systems (claims 15-19) depending on the coating and drying characteristics required for specific applications. It would have been obvious to incorporate effective amounts of conventional coating additives (e.g., pigments and fillers) (claim 20) in order to obtain the coloration and/or surface texture desired for specific applications.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 5/8/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant argues that VOLLENBERG ET AL fails to disclose the invention as presently claimed. However, VOLLENBERG ET AL clearly discloses coating compositions containing the recited polyarylate component and further comprising additional organic compounds with functional groups such as carboxylic acids and/or acid chloride wherein a catalyst facilitates the reaction between the polyarylate and said additional organic compounds.

Allowable Subject Matter.

7. Claims 3, 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

8. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Art Unit: 1773

The prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest the recited component B comprising melamine or urea-formaldehyde resin.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivian Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1506. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney, can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

The General Information telephone number for Technology Center 1700 is (571) 272-1700.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

July 21, 2006



Vivian Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773